

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KEVIN DORSEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-cv-525-pp

NANCY BERRYHILL,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED WITHOUT
PREPAYMENT OF THE FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 2)**

On April 4, 2018, the plaintiff filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final administrative decision denying his claim for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Dkt. No. 1. The plaintiff also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee. Dkt. No. 2.

In order to allow the plaintiff to proceed without paying the filing fee, the court must first decide whether the plaintiff has the ability to pay the filing fee, and if not, it must determine whether the lawsuit is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§1915(a) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Based on the facts presented in the plaintiff's affidavit, the court concludes that he does not have the ability to pay the filing fee. The plaintiff indicates that he has income of \$194 a month from FoodShare, and that that income covers the cost of groceries. Dkt. No. 2 at 1-2. He has no cash or savings/checking accounts, and no other property of value. Id. at 3-4. The

plaintiff also states that he is supposed to be paying \$230 a month in child support, but that he “cannot afford” it. Id. at 2, 4. The court concludes from that information that the plaintiff has demonstrated that he cannot pay the \$350 filing fee and \$50 administrative fee.


The next step is to determine whether the case is frivolous. A case is frivolous if there is no arguable basis for relief either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting Nietzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Casteel v. Pieschek, 3 Fed. 1050, 1056 (7th Cir. 1993)). A person may obtain district court review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. 42 U.S.C. §405(g). The district court must uphold the Commissioner’s final decision as long as the Commissioner used the correct legal standards and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. See Roddy v. Astrue, 705 F.3d 631, 636 (7th Cir. 2013).

The plaintiff’s complaint states that he is disabled, and that the defendant’s conclusions and findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence and are contrary to law and regulation. Dkt. No. 1 at 2. At this early stage in the case, and based on the information in the plaintiff’s complaint, the court concludes that there may be a basis in law or in fact for the plaintiff’s appeal of the Commissioner’s decision, and that the appeal may have merit, as defined by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without paying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 2.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 26th day of April, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Pepper', written over a horizontal line.

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge